

Minutes: Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

Monday, December 4, 2000, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Salt River Project - 1600 North Priest Dr., Tempe, Arizona 85281
Flagstaff Conference Room

	Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Evelyn Dryer	<p>Ms. Dryer welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the November 1, 2000 meeting were approved. – Handouts included: CUC Issue 88 Position, Master Issues List, Data posting requirements proposal,</p> <p>Ms. Dryer gave an update on the joint waiver submitted by PSWG for UDC to be allowed to provide MSP and MRSP services for commercial load profiled customers. The Commissioners decided to postpone any decisions to the December 11th open meeting based on the issues pending Judge Campbell's decision. Evelyn also addressed the decision of continuing the efforts of the PSWG. Since the Utilities Director established the working group, the working group would need to provide direction on future work. Deb gave the direction to continue until further notice. Evelyn opened this issue for comments by the participants. Jim Wontor (APSES) agreed that we should continue on with our work and asked if Deb gave an indication of when a decision would be made. Evelyn responded that the Commission may make a decision around the same time the make the determination of appealing Judge Campbell's decision.</p>	
2	VEE Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Janie Mollon	<p>Stacy Aguayo, Gene Schlecta and Darel Pischoff updated the group on the VEE meeting that took place on November 28th. The VEE group discussed changes that needed to be made within the AZ approved 867. Evelyn stated that there are many issues with 867 changes with the different companies and subcommittees. Evelyn indicated that we might want to establish an 867 group to look at the various changes to the state standard so that all participants have the opportunity to add changes. This issue will be raised at the January Policy meeting. The day of install requirements were postponed until the next VEE meeting. The VEE group also spent some time reviewing MRSP performance monitoring proposals. Since TEP was unable to be at the VEE meeting the group agreed that this issue needed to be deferred to the next meeting when TEP is present.</p> <p>Amos Tsikayi (Teldata Solutions) raised the issue of performing high low checks at the monthly level. Teldata Solutions performs high low checks on a daily basis and not monthly. Amos wanted to verify that this is OK. This issue will be raised at the VEE meeting for discussion. Amos will send his questions to Janie Mollon for the next meeting.</p>	

3	Metering and Meter Reading Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Stacy Aguayo	<p>Ms. Aguayo presented a status report from the Metering and Meter Reading Subcommittee. Forms used for metering process as well as the Business Rules were presented. Based on outstanding items as well as new discussion on resolved business rules, the documents were not ready to submit for approval to the Policy Group. Stacy presented a draft proposal from the Metering group for the requirements for posting beginning and ending intervals.</p> <p>Evelyn raised the issue of communication problems that lead to a lack of data from the new meter set time to the time the MRSP is able to communicate with the meter. Amos raised the issue that often times, the meter is installed before the phone lines are installed. Therefore, the estimation of that time period for the new MRSP may be more difficult than having the current MRSP do the estimating. Amos suggested that the outbound MRSP estimate the date rather than the new MRSP. The group agreed to add this to further discussion since this is contrary to the agreed upon process. The group agreed that there does need to be an exception process for situations like this.</p> <p>When the customer is being returned back to Bundled service, Amos suggested that the UDC contact the MRSP from the site to advise the MRSP to read the meter prior to the removal of the meter. This would make it a cleaner process for retrieving ending data. The group confirmed that most of the UDCs do not have the capability of calling the MRSP from the field. The group agreed to add this issue to future discussion.</p> <p>Action Item: Participants are to review the Proposed Requirements for Posting Beginning and Ending Data by the MRSP. This issue will be assigned to a working group at the January meeting.</p> <p>Mike Ross asked if the UDCs are able to perform the exchange since this is an MSP service. APS confirmed that their approved agreements/Schedules allow for APS to perform the work provided the customer is coming back to Standard Offer. TEP concurred.</p> <p>Action Item: Evelyn will raise this issue to Staff for confirmation/clarification.</p>
4	Billing Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Ms. Renfroe reported that the 810 for ESP Consolidated Billing is complete and ready to submit for approval to the Utilities Director. The Standard is attached to the November 16th minutes. The group would like to have the 810 put out as the AZ Standard as Version 1 with the understanding that this would be reviewed again if the providers identify additional items for discussion. Shirley raised the question of how we move forward of approving the document as the AZ Standard.</p> <p>Evelyn confirmed that the Utility Director approves the Standards. The PSWG will need to approve the 810 for recommendation to the Utility Director.</p>

The group reached consensus to submit to the Utility Director for approval. Implementation of the 810 will need to be addressed. **AZ 810 Version 1 was approved.**

Action Item: All Participants will communicate to Shirley their implementation date for the new 810 by December 8, 2000.

Action Item: After implementation dates have been communicated, Evelyn Dryer will draft a letter and attach the 810 to Deb Scott for approval.

Outstanding Items: Billing group asked Staff to report back on how the dispute process works at the ACC works. The group wants to make sure that all providers are notified of any disputes.

Jim Wontor raised issue 84 – estimation of Final Bills. The group confirmed that this issue was assigned to Policy. Issues List was updated to reflect this change. This issue needs to be placed on a future Policy agenda.

5	Issue 78 Subcommittee status Report and Recommendations	John Wallace	<p>Mr. Wallace presented the status of the Issue 78 group. At the last meeting, the group discussed possible options for long term solutions for Issue 78. At the last meeting, the group assigned action items to the UDCs to come back to the December 5, 2000 meeting with input on how they would handle Issue 78 today or in the short term. There may be a possibility that the group may be able to develop a workable solution after the UDC short-term processes have been reviewed and discussed. Attendance at the last meeting was low and included only UDCs. In order to address this issue with all participant viewpoints represented, the group needs more input/participation from the Competitive Service Providers.</p>
---	---	--------------	---

Jim Wontor expressed that this issue may be premature based on the status of the market. APSES' position would be to move forward as we are doing today and if this issue arises in the future, let the Competitive Providers work it out between themselves. Moving forward would mean the Load Serving ESP would continue to send the DASRs. The LS ESP and the customer's competitive providers would need to work together to coordinate this transaction. The group will discuss how they will proceed in upcoming meetings.

Amos Tsikayi (Teldata Solutions) agreed with APSES' position.

John stated a concern that New West Energy may not be in agreement with APSES' position.

Action Item: Need follow-up with New West Energy

Evelyn
Dryer

TEP has confirmed that there may be a conflict in two rates: Dusk to Dawn which requires a contract and construction costs/maintenance built into the tariff for those customers still under contract with Dusk to Dawn. The second possible conflict is Rate 14. Due to scheduling requirements, a contract is necessary for these customers. For these customers to switch to DA, they would be handled on a case by case basis. Some accounts have a buy out clause allowing them to switch to DA. All other tariffs are all supported by Rules.

Barry Scott (SSVEC) – Stated that there may be some issues with the line extension, some irrigation and contract power tariffs in SSVEC territory.

Action Item: John Wallace will confirm with the other Cooperatives and report back at the next meeting.

APS confirmed that they do not have rates that would preclude a customer from switching to DA. APS' Schedule 1 does require a returning DA customer to select another provider within 60 days or the customer must stay with APS for one year before being eligible for DA again.

Larry Nuszloch confirmed that there is no language in the House Bill or SRP' protocols that preclude the customer from switching to and from DA

The group discussed the definition of "Provider of Last Resort". The group discussed the interpretation of the Rules which mean the UDC are not the Provider of Last Resort for customers with loads greater than 20kw effective January 1, 2001.

The group discussed where we go from here with the known conflicts. The group agreed that a position from Staff was needed.

Action Item: Barbara Keene (ACC Staff) will take this issue and come back with Staff's comments.

The group identified that different companies have interpreted Issue 88 differently. One interpretation is that the customer can own their meter and the UDC will maintain it. The other interpretation is that the customer can own the meter and choose a third party MSP to maintain it.

The group agreed that the issue in the Issues list is not clearly stated

APS stated that although the rules do not allow for Standard Offer customers to own their meter, they will be supportive of any future work/discussion to allow for Standard Offer customers to own their meter. APS also communicated that they are currently working on a process to allow a DA customer to transfer the ownership and maintenance responsibilities of their DA IDR meter to APS when returning to Standard Offer. If after the transfer has taken place, the customer wants to switch back to DA, APS would transfer the ownership back to the customer.

At this time, TEP would not be supportive to a waiver allowing Standard Offer customers to own their own meters. They are however, willing to look at other solutions such as the APS recommendations to make it easier for the customer to switch to and from DA.

Amos Tsikayi (Teldata Solutions) expressed his experience with Standard Offer customers owning their meters does not work out very smoothly when it comes to maintenance. In other states however, the transferring of meter ownership to and from DA does work

John Wallace – most Cooperatives would not be supportive of Standard Offer customer owning their own meters. Would be willing to look at other options if needed.

Darell Pischoff – Some of his customer would be supportive of Standard Offer customers owning meters and others would not be. He stated that it makes sense that we work out some sort of a compromise

Barry Scott (SSVEC) Would not be in favor if we are keeping the concept of Bundled Vs. Unbundled.

Mike Ross (RW Beck on behalf of Citizens) – See CUC handout - Ownership of meter opens up a number of issues but would be willing to look at other solutions.

Larry Nuszloch (SRP)- House Bill is silent regarding ownership – SRP' position is that non-DA customer can not own meters in the SRP territory. If the customer wants IDR metering, SRP will work with customers to install the requested equipment. For Bundled customer who have an IDR meter and opt to switch to DA, the IDR meter can stay in place as long as SRP is the MSP. If they were not the MSP, the third party MSP would need to remove the SRP IDR meter and replace with a DA meter.

Based on the group discussion, there is not consensus in favor of moving forward with discussions to allow Standard Offer customer to own their meters. Evelyn asked the group of what the next step would be. The recommendation was to look at other options to allow customers to move to and from DA without a meter exchange. The question was asked if we need to standardize this or allow the UDCs to identify their own solution.

Action Item: Participants to look at options to allow DA meters to stay in place when returning back to Standard Offer. Participants are to send position papers to Evelyn Dryer by January 24, 2000. Evelyn will consolidate position papers and send out prior to the February 7, 2000 meeting.

7	New Issues	Evelyn Dryer	No new issues were identified
8	Meeting Evaluation	Evelyn Dryer	The group provided feedback.
9	Set Next Agenda	Evelyn Dryer	The group set the agenda for the January 3, 2001
10	Adjourn Meeting	Evelyn Dryer	The meeting was adjourned.

PARTICIPANTS AT DECEMBER 4, 2000
POLICY MEETING
SRP – FLAGSTAFF CONFERENCE ROOM ISB BUILDING

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Brandt, Jana	SRP
Couture, David	TEP
Dryer, Evelyn	TEP
Gillooly, Tony	TEP
Greenrock, June	SRP
Nuszloch, Larry	SRP
Mangen, Ed	Energy Design and Consulting
Pichoff, Darrel	KR Saline & Associates
Renfro, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Ross, Mike	RW Beck / Citizens
Scott, Barry	SSVEC
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Shambaugh, Jeff	Teldata Solutions
Tsikayi, Amos	Teldata Solutions
Wallace, John	GCSECA
Wontor, Jim	APSES

Agenda: **Process Standardization Working Group Meeting**

Wednesday, January 3, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Salt River Project - 1600 North Priest Dr., Tempe, Arizona 85281
Flagstaff Conference Room

Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1 Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Evelyn Dryer	Ms. Dryer will welcome participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet will be circulated. Participants will introduce themselves. Minutes from the December 4, 2000 meeting will be approved.	
2 Issue 78 Subcommittee status Report and Recommendations	John Wallace	Mr. Wallace will present a status report from the Issue 78 (MSPs contracting directly with customers) Subcommittee. Issues may be presented for a vote.	
3 Discussion on issue 86	Evelyn Dryer	ACC Staff to report back with comments on the next steps regarding the known conflicts between UDC tariffs and R14-2-1606(C)(6).	
4 Discussion on issue 88	Evelyn Dryer	The group will review the position papers on alternative ways to address customers keeping their DA IDR meters in place when returning to Standard Offer. (Position papers due to Evelyn Dreyer by January 24th 2000).	
5 Discussion on Posting beginning and final data by the MRSP	Evelyn Dryer	The participants will report back on the proposed requirements presented by the Metering group at the December 4, 2000 Policy meeting.	
6 Waiver for 210 section of the Rules	Evelyn Dryer	Participants need to come to the meeting with a redlined copy of the Waiver prepared in the June PSWG report. The group will review the original waiver and determine additional language that needs to be added to address all of the 210 section.	
7 Action item report from Evelyn Dryer	Evelyn Dryer	Evelyn will report on the status of the approval of the 810 Version 1 by Deb Scott. Evelyn will also report on update from Staff regarding the posting of approved PSWG documents on the ACC website.	
8 Review Ground Rules	Evelyn Dryer	The group will review the original ground rules.	
9 Future Work	Evelyn Dryer	The group will discuss future work and what the next steps are.	
10 Prioritize work for subgroup	Evelyn Dryer	The group will discuss the subgroups that are needed and prioritize the work.	
11 New Issues	Evelyn Dryer	New issues will be identified.	
12 Meeting Evaluation	Evelyn Dryer	The group will provide feedback.	
13 Set Next Agenda	Evelyn Dryer	The group will set the next agenda.	

14 Adjourn Meeting

Evelyn
Dryer

The meeting will be adjourned.